**Reila Bird-Duesing Chapter 7, 8 & 9 Response May 22nd, 2009**

**Part One**:

Chapter 7

What is the main purpose of Expertise-Oriented Evaluation?

* It depends primarily on professional expertise to judge an institution, program, product, or activity. Ex. Drug prevention program, quality of hospital or school

How is Expertise-Oriented Evaluation used?

* It has been used by both national and regional accreditation agencies (two types of accreditation: institutional and specialized or program).
* Universities have used internal review systems.
* Government agencies have used (and abused) peer review
* Funding agencies have used panels of prestigious educators.

What are some of the strengths of Expertise-Oriented Evaluation?

* Focused attention on important issues as whose standards should be used in rendering judgements.
* Thoroughness of accreditation agencies has prevented oversimplification.
* Self-study phase and external review includes both formative and summative evaluation.
* Greatest strength lies in translating observations into statements about program quality.

What are some of the limitations of Expertise-Oriented Evaluation?

* Often permits evaluators to make judgements that reflect little more than personal biases.
* Peer reviews include the public suspicion – possible conflict of interest.

Chapter 8

What is the main purpose of Participant-Oriented Evaluation?

* Evaluators work to portray the multiple needs, values, and perspectives of program stakeholders to be able to make judgements about the value or worth of the program being evaluated.
* Generally include the following characteristics: depend on inductive reasoning; use a multiplicity of data; do not follow a standard plan; record multiple rather than single realities.

What is Stakes Countenance Framework (1967)?

* Attempts to describe the thing being evaluated and render judgement about its worth and value. It assists the evaluator in making data collection and interpretation decisions, and it affords the evaluator the information needed to analyze the level of congruency between outcomes.

What is the Illuminative Evaluation Model?

* A model that focuses more on description and interpretation; and on intensive study of a program as a whole.

What are the different types of Participant-Oriented Evaluation?

* Naturalistic Evaluation, Participatory Evaluation; Utilization-Focused Evaluation; and Empowerment Evaluation

How is Participant-Oriented Evaluation used?

* Used to address issues of immediate interest to evaluation audiences.
* Used to study social-services programs, schools, leadership programs etc...
* Used to produce useful documents such as program guides.

What are some of the strengths of Participant-Oriented Evaluation?

* Can be used to do both quantitative and qualitative methods.
* Emphasized human element
* Directs attention to the needs of those for whom an evaluation is being done.
* Attempts to reflect complexity as accurately as possible.
* Potential for gaining new insights and use new theories.

What are some of the limitations of Participant-Oriented Evaluation?

* Evaluators may not be perceived to be credible.
* Add a political element; subjectivity limitation.
* Minimize the central role of evaluators.

Chapter 9

What are some cautions about alternative evaluation approaches?

* Viewed as neither scientific nor theory; individuals’ conceptions about the field of evaluation; and they are sets of categories – lists, descriptors, and exhortations.

What is the danger of attempting to synthesize alternatives into one model?

* Each evaluation framework offers a different perspective on evaluation that can be applied to some, but not all, evaluation situations.

How will one know which approach is best for a given situation?

* There is almost no research to guide one’s choice.

Why do we need to be cautious of evaluation metaphors?

* Several metaphors assume there is something wrong in the system being evaluated.
* Several metaphors are based on assumptions that people will lie, evade questions, or withhold information.

What does “eclectic uses” of the alternative evaluation approaches mean?

* Choosing and combining concepts from the evaluation approaches to fit the particular situation, using pieces of various evaluation approaches as they seem appropriate.

**Part Two:**

I wasn’t surprised to read about Expertise-Oriented Evaluation. I’ve always assumed that this type of evaluation is used to evaluate programs, product, and activity in our government agencies and institutions such as schools and hospitals. As a stakeholder, I would feel most comfortable and confident knowing that an “expert” with professional judgement was conducting an evaluation as opposed to a “novice”. However, I question the use of informal peer-review system due to the fact that one’s peers may have political biases, personal agendas, or possible conflicts of interest. I am not convinced that informal peer-review systems should have a place in the Expertise-Oriented Evaluation approach. Needless to say, I feel as though it is not my role to assess and review peers in an evaluation situation.

I am particularly fond of the Participant-Oriented Evaluation. Perhaps because it has a “human element” which “directs attention to the needs of those for whom an evaluation is being done” (p.124). Much of what we do in the area of education is closely related to the Participant-Oriented Evaluation approach. For instance, naturalistic evaluation occurs on a daily basis in our classrooms where the teacher observes the learning as it occurs naturally without constraining or controlling the environment. As a result of the observations and/or anecdotal notes, educators work hard to ensure that the diverse needs of their students are met by continually evaluating and re-evaluating their programs and teaching practices. Educators also rely on quantitative and qualitative methods when making judgements about student progress. Although the evaluations are quite informal, the participants are at the heart of the evaluation.

After reading chapters 7, 8, and 9 this week, I’ve come to realize that there is no one evaluation approach that is superior to another. It is evident that although each has been designed with a specific purpose in mind, an experienced, professional evaluator literally uses more than one approach in order to conduct a quality evaluation. Thus, the analogy of the carpenter at the end of chapter nine put the reasoning into perspective. “Just as a skilled carpenter will not use only one hammer to build a fine house, so a skilled evaluator will not depend solely on one approach to plan and conduct a high-quality evaluation” (p.165). To be honest, I was relieved to read that analogy because up until now, I’ve always wondered how one would decide what approach to use and for what purpose.